

colleagues on the EPW Committee had left a clear roadmap on exactly how to cut a consensus deal, but instead, the House chairman forced his committee to mark up \$547 billion littered—littered—with Green New Deal policies.

Compared to the last multiyear highway bill, it nearly doubles the share of resources for mass urban transit projects, while upping the road-and-bridge funding Middle America relies on by not nearly as much. In contrast to smart permit-streaming steps taken by our colleagues' Senate bill, it largely neglects to help the communities and builders who spent years wading through Federal redtape before they can even break ground.

The recent history of investment in roads, bridges, waterways, airports, and broadband tells us that smart, targeted solutions are capable of earning overwhelming support. But until Democrats get serious, the road ahead for consensus action on our Nation's infrastructure will only get steeper.

#### ABORTION

Mr. President, now on another matter, unfortunately the administration's radical left turn touches much more than just infrastructure policy. In fact, it includes an unprecedented new threat to the basic dignity of human life.

On the campaign trail last year, President Biden announced that he would abandon a mainstream position he had held literally for decades: that taxpayer dollars should not be used to fund abortions. It was an alarming reversal. But under immense pressure from the far left, President Biden kept his radical campaign promise, shrugged off a commonsense precedent upheld by administrations of both parties for more than 40 years, and proposed a budget that entirely erases the protections of the Hyde amendment.

When asked about it at a hearing yesterday, the Secretary of Health and Human Services confirmed that the President's change of heart was not a mistake, saying: "The budget is a reflection of what the President has said." This new fringe stance on taxpayer-funded abortions aligns much more closely with the Secretary's own views, as our colleagues may recall from his confirmation process.

Now, it is no secret that the Democratic Party has been hurtling to the left on abortion in recent years. Here in the Senate, our colleagues have repeatedly blocked efforts to limit elective abortion after the 20th week. Their opposition keeps the United States in a rather inglorious company alongside China, North Korea, and just four other countries that fail to offer this basic protection to the unborn.

So President Biden's decision to abandon the Hyde amendment aligns him with an increasingly radical consensus among elected Democrats, but it puts him way out of step with the clear majority of Americans who oppose taxpayer-funded abortion.

The administration's budget request continues to make headlines for all the

wrong reasons, but its plan to sell out on longstanding protections for the most vulnerable Americans might just be the lowest of the low.

#### BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, now on one final matter, the latest data from Customs and Border Protection show that the current fiscal year has seen the highest number of migrant apprehensions since 2006. Let me say that again. We are 8 months into fiscal year 2021, but the CBP has already apprehended more migrants at our southern border than in any full year since 2006.

It is hard to overstate the humanitarian and security crisis that has unfolded this year. Monthly arrivals of unaccompanied minors reached their highest levels on record. Higher border traffic concealed an alarming rise of flows of deadly drugs like fentanyl. CBP recently announced its apprehensions even included individuals who are on the terrorist watch list.

The origins of this crisis are certainly not a mystery. The Democrats who have spent the last few months in the White House focusing on what to call it instead of how to fix it are the same Democrats who spent last year sending potential migrants dangerous mixed signals from the campaign trail: "You want to flee. . . . you should come." That was future President Biden. "No . . . they should not be deported." That was then-Senator KAMALA HARRIS.

Sure enough, CBP officials are reporting that many migrants they encounter believe that "there has been a change in immigration laws . . . a gap in enforcement on the U.S. border" under the new administration.

But if you ask now-Vice President HARRIS, the administration's point person on the border, there is apparently blame to be found everywhere but her own party's rhetoric on immigration, and there is value in going just about anywhere but the border itself.

This week, the Vice President's investigation of the root causes of migration brought her to Guatemala and Mexico. The administration's delegation was apparently keen to talk about factors like corruption and climate change, but the President of Guatemala had a different agenda. As he put it, "We asked the United States Government to send more of a clear message." Sound familiar?

Of course, one place Vice President HARRIS did not stop on her trip was the U.S.-Mexico border, and, bizarrely, when she even plans to do that remains completely unclear. When asked about it in an interview this week, the Vice President responded with a laugh: "I don't understand the point that you're making."

For months, the Biden administration has assured the American people that when it comes to our southern border, Vice President HARRIS has it covered, and they are betting on it. The White House budget request proposes no increase in funding for DHS,

whose agents are working overtime to contend with the crisis on the ground. Well, there are a lot of folks on both sides of the border who are still waiting for the point person to actually take charge.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 131, Zahid N. Quraishi, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Sherrod Brown, Jon Ossoff, Alex Padilla, Jacky Rosen, Tammy Duckworth, Brian Schatz, Chris Van Hollen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Robert Menendez, Richard Blumenthal, Patty Murray, Martin Heinrich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patrick J. Leahy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Zahid N. Quraishi, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

(Mr. WARNOCK assumed the Chair.)

(Ms. BALDWIN assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. WARNOCK assumed the Chair.)

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 228 Ex.]

#### YEAS—83

Baldwin	Grassley	Peters
Barrasso	Hagerty	Portman
Bennet	Hassan	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Risch
Booker	Hickenlooper	Romney
Boozman	Hirono	Rosen
Brown	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cantwell	Kaine	Sanders
Capito	Kelly	Schatz
Cardin	Kennedy	Schumer
Carper	King	Scott (SC)
Casey	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Collins	Leahy	Sinema
Coons	Lee	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lujan	Tester
Cortez Masto	Lummis	Thune
Cotton	Manchin	Tillis
Cramer	Markey	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Van Hollen
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Moran	Warren
Ernst	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wicker
Fischer	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Young
Graham	Padilla	